

**IDENTIFYING THE HUMAN IMPACT AND MANAGING CHANGE WITHIN THE
GRAND CHUTE FIRE DEPARTMENT**

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP

BY: Todd A. Farley
Grand Chute Fire Department
Grand Chute, Wisconsin

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy as part of the Executive Fire
Officer Program

January 2007

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I hereby certify that this paper constitutes my own product, that where the language of others is set forth, quotation marks so indicate, and that appropriate credit is given where I have used the language, ideas, expressions, or writings of another.

Signed: _____

ABSTRACT

The Grand Chute Fire Department (GCFD) is experiencing rapid change that will continue and there hasn't been a study on the impact these changes are having on personnel. The purpose of this applied research paper was to identify the human impact of change within the department and then to identify, recommend, and implement an effective change management process. Descriptive research supported by evaluative methodologies were utilized to answer the following questions:

1. What are the impacts of change among the personnel of the GCFD?
2. What, if any are other departments of similar size using to identify the impacts of change among personnel?
3. What, if any are other departments of similar size using to manage change within their organizations?
4. What are recommended strategies or processes for managing change within a fire department?
5. What change management processes would be most effective to improve the outcome and effectively manage change within the GCFD?

The research procedures included literature review, an interview with a business consultant, an inner-department survey, and an external department survey. The results of the research revealed department organizational weaknesses regarding change management and the impact change has on personnel. Included in the recommendations are a number of change management processes primarily from business and industry leaders and educators that can reduce the impact of change to GCFD personnel, along with improving the organizational change management process.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Abstract 3

Table of Contents 4

Introduction 5

Background and Significance 6

Literature Review 12

Procedures 27

Results 32

Discussion 63

Recommendations 71

References 74

Appendix A 77

Appendix B 81

INTRODUCTION

During the last two years the Grand Chute Fire Department (GCFD) has experienced change at a quick pace. The speed at which the change has occurred is only going to continue and in some cases will drastically increase with the advent of new fire stations, apparatus, equipment, increased full time staffing, a new records management system, fire service technology, the increased reliance on the electronic medium, an increased focus on regional collaboration, a change in the elected officials, and a potential change within town administration.

The pace at which change has occurred over the past two years has caused problems within the department manifesting as confusion among personnel on policies issues, operational issues, and personnel issues. The problems caused by the speed of change or the lack of appropriately managing this change and the anticipated future change has created an increased amount of confusion, anxiety among personnel as seen as tensions developing between full time and paid-on-call staff, signs of stress, short tempers, irritability, turn over of personnel, and low attendance at training, department meetings, and emergency incidents.

The problem is the GCFD is experiencing rapid change that will continue and there hasn't been a study on the impact these changes are having on personnel. The purpose of this applied research paper is to identify the human impact of change within the department and then to identify, recommend, an effective change management processes.

Descriptive research supported by evaluative methodologies will be utilized to answer the following questions:

1. What are the impacts of change among the personnel of the GCFD?

2. What, if any are other departments of similar size using to identify the impacts of change among department personnel?
3. What, if any are other departments of similar size using to manage change within their organizations?
4. What are recommended strategies or processes for managing change within a fire department?
5. What change management processes would be the most effective to improve the outcome and effectively manage change within the GCFD?

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The GCFD is a combination fire department located in east central Wisconsin, with the City of Green Bay 25 miles to the north and the City of Oshkosh 20 miles to the south. The Town can best be described as the commercial center of the region and is home to the largest regional shopping district in Wisconsin north of Milwaukee. The Town is predominately suburban with numerous commercial and residential developments and has remained rural along its northern boundary. Due to the large commercial, manufacturing, and multi-family developments Grand Chute is the largest Town in the State and for its population and size has one of the highest assessed values in the State of Wisconsin at \$2,210,727,000 (<http://www.dor.state.wi.us/equ/2006/strout.pdf>).

The Town is rapidly developing and carries a reputation of being desirable for commercial, light manufacturing, and single and multifamily residential development. According to the 2003 census, the Town has a population of 19,760. The 1990 census reported a population of 14,490 and the 2000 census reported a population of 18,392 (<http://www.census.gov/>).

The Grand Cute Volunteer Fire Department was formed in 1938 by a group of townsmen (<http://angelfire.com/wi2/gcfd/>). Today, the GCFD is a combination fire department consisting of 10 full time and 50 paid-on-call (POC) personnel working out of two stations. Full time personnel consist of four administrative and six operations personnel. Full time operations personnel are assigned to work three 12-hour shifts 06:00 to 18:00 each shift, and then off for three days. There are three full time personnel assigned to a shift, working out of one station, staffing one engine. The four administrative personnel is the Fire Chief, Assistant Chief - Prevention, Assistant Chief - Training/Safety, and the Administrative Assistant. Administrative personnel work a standard 40-hour workweek filling in operationally on shift, when needed.

The 50 POC personnel consist of an Assistant Chief - Paid-On-Call Services, two Captains, four Lieutenants, and 43 Firefighters. POC personnel are relied on heavily for staffing during emergency incidents. In many ways POC personnel are similar to volunteer firefighters, however they do receive a competitive hourly wage for all work activities. The POC Captains are responsible for a station, the activities at the station, and personnel assigned to that station. Each Captain has two Lieutenants assigned to them and each Lieutenant has between 10-12 firefighters assigned to them.

POC personnel response to one of the two stations anytime the department is dispatched on an incident requiring multiple resources. Additionally, a crew of three POC personnel staff the engine at station one every night of the week from 18:00 to 06:00 the next day. Each POC officer is assigned one of the night shifts each week along with a POC firefighter qualified as a driver/operator.

In 2005, the department responded to 1,169 emergency called for service (FireHouse© Software, 2005). Emergency responses included all incidents requiring prehospital emergency medical care, fire suppression, hazardous materials responses, and specialized rescue. All fire

prevention activities are completed by full time staff as agreed upon per the bargaining contract with IAFF local 3655. In 2005, the department conducted 3,728 fire inspections, 48 public education events, and 44 public relations activities (FireHouse© Software, 2005).

As with any fire department the GCFD is rich with history and department specific traditions. The GCFD was a volunteer fire department until the first full time firefighter was hired in 1982. This firefighter was hired to assist with maintaining the two stations, apparatus, equipment, and respond to emergency incidents. In 1982 the department only responded to fire emergencies and had a yearly incident volume of just fewer than 300 per year. In 1985, the initial construction phase of the Fox River Mall was completed starting the commercial industry boom for the Town along with the region. The influx of the commercial industry drove the development of light manufacturing and residential developments. The once small rural township transformed into a growing suburban community at a rapid pace.

Personnel changes and additions continued for the department. The fire chief was a part time employee working an unscheduled number of hours per week. Personnel on a part time basis completed fire inspections. As the commercial development continued the department hired a full time fire inspector supervisor in 1986. Additional demands on the fire department continued. The department continued to staff one engine with one full time firefighter during the day and a POC firefighter at night. In 1990, an additional full time firefighter was hired to assist in meeting the fire inspection demands. Subsequent full time personnel were added in 1991, one in 1993, one in 2000, and two in 2003.

In 2001, the Town Board authorized the Town Administrator to hire a consulting firm to complete a study on the fire department. The study was completed with numerous

recommendations for improvement made. One of the recommendations was to budget for and hire a full time fire chief to handle the numerous responsibilities of the growing fire department (Group I Resources, Inc.).

In 2002 the first full time fire chief was hired and remained until his departure in late 2003. In 2004 the second full time fire chief (the author of this ARP) was hired. The 2001 study was used as a template to guide the growth and improvements within the fire department. Even though significant growth and development within the Town continued the economy suffered and to municipal government in the region slowed dramatically. In 2005 the department was able to add a full time Assistant Chief in charge of training, safety, and governmental compliance.

In 2006 the department completed a year-long strategic planning process and the fire chief presented the GCFD five-year strategic plan to the Town Administrator and Town Chairman. The strategic planning document highlighted many of the shortcomings of the department. Staffing issues, POC daytime availability, long response times, employee recruitment/retention, increasing demands on training, increasing workloads on fire inspection, education, code enforcement, an aging fleet of apparatus and equipment, and lack of technological infrastructure were all explained in detail (www.grandchute.net).

The strategic planning document was presented to the Town Board and then again to the general public at the annual Town Meeting held in April 2006. The regional newspaper completed a story on the GCFD presenting the strategic plan, the poor response times, and staffing issues (Lowe, 2006). Many of the local television and radio news organizations completed stories on the department as well. Input from the public was received and with a few exceptions was in favor of enhancing the fire department.

Internally, the department was experiencing change due to a new focus on a structured training, employee development, credentialing, safety, governmental compliance, and realignment of the officer's responsibilities. Regional changes were occurring affecting the emergency communications center, records management system, training, collaboration between departments, emergency management programs, national incident management system, statewide mutual aid and numerous other programs. All changes were viewed as positive for the department and region however, has become very difficult to manage internally and difficult for department personnel to accept due to the speed at which the change is occurring.

In October 2006, the officers of the department completed a strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis as a planning tool for the upcoming year. During this planning meeting several areas of weakness and threats were identified regarding the future in terms of personnel and the changes related to potential downsizing of POC staff, reduction and the potential for the elimination of POC officers, duty officer program, and the growing responsibilities of the full time staff including the officers within the full time staff.

The GCFD has made a significant commitment to the POC staff of the department in the area of training, salaries, equality in rank and structure, and participation in the department. Likewise, the POC staff have made significant contributions and displayed a significant commitment to the department. POC officers consistently work an average of 900-1000 hours each year. POC firefighters assigned to a weekly shift work an average of 800-1000 hours each year (FireHouse© Software, 2005). The weakness and threats identified in the SWOT analysis and subsequent discussion revealed a level of frustration with department leadership because they feel as though with the future changes in their position within the department will change. The implication of the future change may be met with wide-scale resistance making it

increasingly difficult for the department to make the necessary changes to meet the service demands of the growing town.

The author of this ARP has seen results and has been a part of the organizations that improperly managed change within an organization. Throughout the history of the fire service important lessons have been learned and examples provided of departments that have faced similar if not the same kind of change, some providing poor examples and some providing a model for fire service organizational change. Private business and leading corporations have been dealing with change developing best practices for managing organizational change.

This applied research paper relates to the United States Fire Administration's (USFA) National Fire Academy, Executive Fire Officer Program (EFOP) goal to "provide senior officers and others in key leadership roles with: An understanding of the need to transform fire and emergency services organizations from being reactive to proactive: with an emphasis on leadership development" (FEMA, 2003). Additionally, this ARP relates to the USFA goal of reducing life and economic losses through fire service leadership, advocacy, coordination and support (USFA, 2004). The ability for fire departments to effectively manage change within their organizations will allow for a proactive approach to the USFA operational objective of fire service organizations maintaining the ability to respond to emerging issues. The research conducted for this applied research paper relates to the information taught in the National Fire Academy Executive Leadership course comparative to the staged goal of this course. "The chief executive will develop the ability to conceptualize and employ the key processes used by effective executive-level managers" (EL, R125, 5th Edition, 1st Printing—Oct 2005, pg v).

Descriptive research supported by evaluative methodologies will be utilized to identify the human impact of change on the personnel of the GCFD along with identifying,

recommending, and implementing effective change management process discovered during the stated research process and potential lessons learned from other fire service organizations and the corporate business community.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is to gather information needed to address the questions asked in the research. The research and literature reviewed includes emergency service trade journals and internet sites, books related to managing change, discussions with professionals such as consultants who work in the corporate setting, and literature from corporations directly relating to change management. While completing the literary review, opinions and findings were examined in relation to the project.

Before recommending strategies or processes to manage change can be recommended or implemented a review of organizational change and culture must be explored. In the corporate business world change is ever present and usually a product of a company responding to an external source such as increasing competition, new technology, the economy or governmental political decisions. Often times the change efforts have gone under banners such as total quality management, reengineering, right sizing, restructuring, cultural change, and turnaround. In almost every case the goal has been the same: to make fundamental changes in how business is conducted in order to cope with a new more challenging market environment (Kotter, 2006).

Kotter (2006m p. 2) writes: "The most general lesson to be learned from the more successful cases is that the change process goes through a series of phases that, in total, usually require a considerable length of time." Skipping steps and taking shortcuts will often lead to mistakes and procedures results that are less than satisfying. Developing an understanding of a solid change process and spending the necessary time on an effective process will lead to a better

understanding of change. Kotter further explains (2006, p. 3) "A second very general lesson is that critical mistakes in any of the phases can have a devastating impact, slowing momentum and negative hard-won gains." Due to the little understanding and relatively little experience in renewing organizations experienced leaders in general often make mistakes in managing change. Kotter explains there are 8 common errors made that executive make concerning transformational change and leading the change process:

1. Not establishing a great enough sense of urgency.
2. Not creating a powerful enough guiding coalition.
3. Lacking a vision.
4. Under communicating with vision.
5. Not removing obstacles to the new vision.
6. Not systematically planning for and creating short-term wins.
7. Declaring victory too soon.
8. Not anchoring the changes in the corporation's culture.

Tipping point leadership hinges on the insight that in any organization, once the beliefs and energies of a mass of people are engaged, conversion to a new idea will spread like an epidemic, bringing fundamental change very quickly. This theory originating from the epidemiology field suggests that when utilized a change movement can be implemented by leaders who make an impression on why the change is important, concentrate their resources on what really matters, mobilize commitment within the organizations key personnel, and are successful in silencing the most vocal nay sayers. Kim and Mauborgne (2006, p. 24) highlight this change mechanism using William Bratton former Police Commissioner of the New York City Police Department (1994-1996). During Commissioner Bratton's short tenure as Police

Commissioner he utilized tipping point leadership to make drastic fundamental changes within the police department that resulted in an overall 17% drop in crime, 39% drop in felony crimes, 50% drop in murders, 35% drop in theft, 200,000 fewer crime victims a year than what was experienced in 1990. Commissioner Bratton improved the citizen rating of the New York Police Department to a 74% positive rating versus a 37% positive rating four years earlier.

"Tipping point leaders like Bratton do not rely on numbers to break through the organization's cognitive hurdles. Instead, they put their key managers face-to-face with the operational problems so the managers cannot evade reality" (Kim and Mauborgne, 2006, p. 25). Placing the managers in front of the problem personalizes the issue. Poor performance becomes something the managers actually witness instead of just hearing about or evaluating statistics. The message delivered is performance is poor and needs to be corrected. The message has an impression on people change is necessary, and achievable.

In the corporate world change efforts commonly fail due to management and employees view change differently. Senior management view change as an opportunity to correct a problem, enhance profit, and potentially serving self-interest. Employees view change as disruptive, intrusive, or potential job loss. To close this gap, Paul Strebel (2006, p. 45) states: "managers must reconsider their employees, the personal compacts, mutual obligations, and commitments that exist between employees and the company." A personal compact involves employees and organizations having reciprocal obligations and mutual commitments, both stated and implied, and define the relationship between labor and management. From an employee's point of view, personal commitment to the organization usually comes from an understanding of the following questions:

1. What am I supposed to do for the organization?

2. What help will I get to do the job?
3. How and when will my performance be evaluated, and what form will the feedback be?
4. What will I be paid, and how will pay relate to my performance?

Employees will determine their level of commitment to the organization along the psychological dimension of their personal compact by asking the following:

1. How hard will I really have to work?
2. What recognition, financial reward, or other personal satisfaction will I get for my efforts?
3. Are the rewards worth it?

Strebel suggests employees will "gauge an organization's culture through social dimension of their personal compacts." Employees will relate the commitment the organization has regarding the mission statement, vision, and values. The employee will observe the actions of management personnel and whether they practice what they preach. The employees will translate those perceptions into how the organization really works taking into consideration the unspoken (implied) rules that apply to career development, promotions, decision-making, conflict resolution, resource allocation, risk sharing, and layoffs. The employee will respect the social dimension and try to answer the following questions:

1. Are my values similar to those of others in the organization?
2. What are the real rules that determine who gets what in this company?

Creating change within an organization is often similar to running a political campaign. Garvin and Roberto (2006, p. 90) states: "Most people are reluctant to alter their habits. What worked in the past is good enough; in the absence of a dire threat, employees will keep doing what they've always done. And when an organization has had a succession of leaders, resistance

to change is even stronger." In order for change to become meaningful, leaders must design and run an effective persuasion campaign. Significant work must be done up front to ensure employees will actually engage in what is being proposed. Garvin and Roberto call for a four-part communications strategy setting the stage for acceptance by employees. The four phases of a persuasion campaign consists of the following:

1. Convince employees that radical change is imperative; demonstrate why the new direction is the right one.
2. Position and frame the preliminary plan; gather feedback; announce final plan.
3. Manage employee mood through constant communication.
4. Reinforce behavioral guidelines to avoid backsliding.

In 1946, General Motors (GM) commissioned Peter Drucker to write a policy report for the company. The result of Drucker's work was his book *Concept of the Corporation* (1946). Drucker's work challenged conventional corporate structure and cited decentralization as a crucial element missing from organizations during this time period. The managers at GM were not receptive because Drucker stated, "employees should be viewed as resources rather than costs" (1946).

In the 1960's GM had been dominating the car industry since the end of World War II. Competition was almost nonexistent to GM and "made in Japan," the non-U.S. competitors were not a threat. The American automobile industry required drastic and dramatic change in order to respond to the growing industrial environment. In the 1970's, change management practices responded and focused on radical change helping to stabilize the market in the United States in favor of the American automobile industry. In 1981, Chrysler posted the largest loss ever in U.S.

corporate history (Lawrence and Dyer, 1983). The advice at the time was that organizational changes had to be "big and destructive" today this is termed "creative destruction." Abrahamson (2004, p. 7) states: "To create a new hopeful future, such creative destruction had to cast aside all that was wrong about the past, whatever the pain." In relation to the automobile industry the pain was so intense the danger of backsliding into another period of instability became a real possibility. "Revolutionary change had to be followed by yet more rapid, continuous, destructive, and relentless changes in order to keep the firm more flexible and faster than its competition" (Abrahamson, 2004).

In some cases fire service organizations resemble GM in the 1960's seeking only stability and avoiding the necessary steps needing to be taken for meaningful long-range strategic change. Organizations such as this place an emphasis on change for the sake of change reacting to something that is occurring in the present perhaps precipitated by the past and not reacting in a proactive manner. Eric Abrahamson presents the theory of creative recombination whereas a less disruptive approach to change is introduced. Creative recombination minimizes disruptive and painful destruction by using organizational assets already in place, recombining them creatively in a new and successful fashion.

"Mastering creative recombination comes from understanding the diversity of techniques that leaders, managers, and employees can utilize" (Abrahamson. 204). There are three very different action techniques to choose from:

1. Cloning: Reproducing a successful action into a problem to achieve the desired change.
2. Customizing: The change must be altered to fit different areas in an organization.

Modifying the means to achieve the same ends successfully across the organization.

3. Translating: Certain recombinants are essentially incompatible with new contexts. They need to be translated, interpreted, reinvented, and rendered useful in the new situation.

In Jeff Davidson's book *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Change Management* (2002) four approaches to change management are presented:

1. The Rational-empirical Approach
2. The Normative-Reeducative Approach
3. The Power-Coercive Approach
4. The Environmental-Adaptive Approach

The theory Davidson presents is the culture within every organization is different and by classifying the change environment into categories the appropriate change management plan can be implemented.

The rational-empirical approach "is based on the belief that there are predictable behaviors of people, and that they pay particular attention to their own self-interests" (Davidson, 2002, p. 63). Persuasion is the key when using this approach and persuasion is easier to expect when a person viewed as an expert delivers the message. Davidson (2002, p. 65) states: "People have a natural inclination to respond favorably when they perceive they are interacting with an expert. Resistance levels drop. The potential for participation and even enthusiasm increases." This approach requires managers to be effective and open to communications from peers. This creates openness among subordinate employees and managers, involves teamwork, and allows the change process to proceed with input.

The Normative-Reeducative Approach is a scientific approach to change management. It is based on the fact that people will not change just because they are asked to do so. The theory is people will change when they feel the change will be in their own best interests. Reeducation

of people with the intent to change human behavior addressing core values, beliefs, relationships, and connections people have to develop a better understanding of the change. Page 76 of

Davidson's book presents the key principles of Reeducation as it relates to change management.

- Processes are alike - The change manager first needs to understand the beliefs and behaviors of the targets of change.
- Reeducation must fulfill a task - Education alone will not change a person's belief system unless the culture was addressed.
- Experiences alone cannot help to foster knowledge - People will embrace a new change if they're able to participate in the design and execution of the discovery process.
- Social action is steered by one's perceptions - For people to change they have to perceive their relationship to the immediate environment is changing.
- Correct knowledge doesn't overcome false perceptions - When individuals believe they are in a highly supportive environment they will be prompted to relinquish their prior views.
- Incorrect stereotypes originate from incorrect concepts - Prejudice will diminish one's ability to think rationally and lead one to astray.
- Changes from the heart don't flow from changes of the head - Even if someone has the facts, that don't mean they are going to act upon them. Pure logic is not a motivator.
- Individuals' changes are linked to group membership - The development of an individual's values system is directly related to the individual's participation. This is a fundamental core principle of this theory - When we feel we are part of a community, the community's view and inclination to change become the same.

The Power-Coercive Approach to change management is based on the thought that people are compliant and will do what they are told with little or no convincing. Also known as forced-coercion, using this approach can be very risky and potentially great returns. The premise is people are compliant and will respond to the power of authority, fear, punishment, and the lure of rewards. Davidson (2002, p. 88) cautions the use of this approach in respect to "never ask people to engage in behavior that threatens life or limb, or has long-term negative impact on their mental or emotional beings." This approach to managing change suggests managers need to be tough but fair, and communicate your instructions so employees understand what is expected. The drawback with the approach is if you ease too soon or too often employees will revert back to old ways.

The environmental adaptive approach assumes people attempt to avoid any disruption or loss, however they do have the ability to adjust to new situations. Under this approach a single change management approach will not work effectively. Essentially, a mix of all four of the approaches must be utilized to effectively manage change. Understanding people will instinctively resist change, however they have the ability to adjust. In order to make change permanent "abolish the previously existing establishment, and create a new structure that people quickly adapt to" (2002, p. 104). Spend more time on the needs and opportunities of the organization. Encourage new ideas and changes to the market or industry potentially abandoning old ideas. Demonstrate to the stakeholders what they already know and how they do it relates to what they need to know and do in the future to make transition easier and less threatening.

In the book, *The End of Change* (Scott-Morgan, Hoving, Smit, Van Der Slot, 2001) the concept of change occurring so rapidly worldwide throughout the corporate world, causing greater disruption, making it increasingly difficult to change, and builds even more pressure for

performance leading to even more initiatives. The author's state: "Companies need to change faster and faster, yet their employees' energy for change is becoming exhausted. As employees suffer from change fatigue and yearn for less disruption, executives are striving for ever-greater change" (2001, p. xi). Further explained "The Fortune 500 companies are currently spending twice their profits on change. Yet they're satisfied with only half the results."

The focus of *The End of Change* is creating an environment of stability without stifling growth and innovation. The results found in this book came from a 6-year study of Fortune 500 companies highlighting their successes and failures in implementing change. At the end of this study the authors provide the following answer (2001, p. xxi): "Innovative companies should not fixate on change; they should concentrate on maximizing stability, with the innovation built in." The results of the study presents a formula to help manage the change based on the frequency of innovation along with the level of innovation.

The planning process utilized in public administration typically involves three cycles, a year-to-year plan often reflected in the form of a budget, three to five years usually seen as capital improvement or capital outlay, and a longer range plan known as a master or strategic plan. The process of planning is essentially more important than the plan itself and usually involves structure, establishing direction, coordinating, program activity, and evaluating the plan once implemented (Coleman, 2003). The process of planning is cyclic and continuously evolving in many ways just like the fire service continues to evolve. Coleman (2003, p. 10) continues by stating: "The need for change from a management point of view, is the realization that if the community changes, the organization must change with it. Any time the plan, the structure, the direction, and the program activity remains almost identical for more than five to seven years, an organization may be working its way toward inefficiency and ineffectiveness."

Creating an environment in which personnel realize their potential while being included and valued helps to create a workforce adaptive to change. Steven Edwards (2000, p. 30-31) recommends the following factors for leaders to consider in creating a positive environment:

- Fairness
- Respect
- Trust
- Flexibility
- Sensitivity

Edwards elaborates by providing five basic skills of an effective leader when attempting to instill these factors:

- Empower others
- Develop others
- Value diversity
- Work for change
- Communicate responsibility

In her book, *The DNA of Leadership*, Judith Glaser (2006) introduces a new way of capitalizing on change. The concepts introduced challenge managers to assess their internal makeup as a leader and place a value on rethinking organizational change in a manner that involves the people within the organization. *The DNA of Leadership* redefines the power of leadership and instills the value leaders have of influencing change through conversations and relationships throughout the organization. "The premise of this book is that organizations, too, have their own DNA" (2006, p. 4).

The book *The Manager as Change Leader* (2005) incorporates change leadership as a core skill for managers and examines the complexities of change from the manager's perspective, providing helpful tools to implement within an organization. The tools provided in this text start with two self-assessments, assessing one's ability to manage change and provide feedback:

- **Change-Leadership Characteristics - Self-Assessment:** Reflects the most common characteristics employees desire in their leaders. This instrument has a self-assessment along with an assessment by others. The most accurate evaluation of your skills will be the results of multiple inputs from personnel.
- **Change-Leadership Competency Questionnaire:** This assessment provides a comprehensive evaluation of your knowledge, skills, and abilities relating to your role, responsibilities, skills and competencies as a change leader.

Once the self-assessments are completed an action plan for self-development can be developed. Several "tools for success" are provided in this text and if utilized correctly personal insight into change management, along with support and involvement of peers and staff can help develop change management/leadership skills.

The culture within a fire department will often influence change and how change is managed. In the article *Search for Values* (Carrizzo & Gerling, 2006) the issue of a growing combination fire department and internal conflicting values among personnel is discussed. Chief Carrizzo recognized a deteriorating cooperative culture developing with the Southern Platte Fire Protection District and working with the officers of the department attempted to identify the shared values of full time and volunteer staff. The result was a series of meetings with no real results.

A consultant specializing in leadership based on values was utilized to assist the department in developing organizational values. This led morale surveys and structured leadership development sessions with chief officers. A process for identifying values among the leadership of the department was utilized and a continued series of meetings led to the development of the department's values. With the values implemented the department continues to practice the same process respecting the established values of the department.

Understanding employees and managing change requires management to understand the basic human needs of people in the workplace. Abraham Maslow's theory of the hierarchy of needs developed in the 1940's addressed the needs that basically motivate human beings. The five basic needs are biological and physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization. The Internet site http://www.accel-team.com/maslow_/maslow_nds_02.html highlights how this theory has been modified since the original adaptation Dr. Maslow produced. The adaptation relevant to this research focuses on self-actualization in regards to employees and the organizations they work for. The concept of self-actualization relates directly to the present day challenges and opportunities for employers and organizations to provide meaningful development for employees. Employees have a basic human need to self-actualize in the work place. "The best modern employers and organizations are beginning to learn at last: that sustainable success is built on a serious and compassionate commitment to helping people identify, pursue and reach their own personal unique potential."

In an effort to discuss change management and evaluating the effects of change on personnel the author of the ARP met with Heather Payette, MA, Corporate Consultant for Theda Care At Work, on October 20, 2006. Ms. Payette was asked what she viewed as obstacles of change within an organization. "Any time there is a change in an organization people will deal

with the change in the same manner as with any organization because people are people. They recognize threats to the change (job loss) which in turn leads to informal loss of position"

(personal communication, October 20, 2006). Mrs. Payette recommended two sources used by Theda Care At Work when dealing with change issues internally at her workplace, along with recommendations to clients:

Mrs. Payette provided a handout from the *Mastering the Change Curve Facilitator Guide - Second Edition*. The handout provided was a copy only not and not an actual text. The Mastering the Change Curve concept is used when preparing to have a discussion, conversation, or

workshop and it relates to helping people master change. The method used provides people the ability to understand the broader context in which change is occurring. The change curve is a series of phases as people go through an understanding period with the change. People progress through the four phases at differing speeds. The four phases include:

- Phase 1: Denial
- Phase 2: Resistance
- Phase 3: Exploration
- Phase 4: Commitment

Regardless of the speed at which a person moves through the four phases, everyone must eventually reach the commitment phase in order to perform effectively within the changed organization. As stated in The Change Curve Model, the model is based on the following principles of change:

- Change is an ongoing process rather than an event.
- There is a progressive sequence of change behaviors that needs to be experienced and mastered to be effective in handling change.

- Seemingly negative behaviors such as denial, apprehension, anger, and resistance are normal and adaptive elements in the change process.
- There are specific strategies available to increase change mastery.
- The progression through the phases of change represents an opportunity for growth and responsible risk taking.

The second source Mrs. Payette recommended was the Theda Care Improvement System that is used internally by Theda Care to implement change. This improvement system is based off of the Kaizen Model developed by Japanese and used extensively by Toyota as a quality improvement change management system. "Kaizen is a long-term philosophy founded on 5 specific elements; teamwork, personal discipline, improved morale, quality circles, and suggestions for improvement. The model is people oriented, easy to implement and has proven success over long-term change situations that allow time for employees to adapt and grow into a successful culture" H. Payette (personal communication, October 20, 2006).

The Kaizen culture focuses on elimination of waste in the form of any error or defect but in addition to addressing processes at the base level it addresses management's ability to manage change and seeks to put into place a culture of continuous improvement. "It does this through focusing on teamwork, personal discipline, morale, quality circles and communications to facilitate suggestions for improvement" (Vitalo, 2006). Mrs. Payette stated this concept works well to facilitate change within an organization because it involves groups of employees, usually working in small groups, to seek change alternatives.

In summary, the majority of the literature reviewed was from sources used by the corporate world to evaluate and manage change. Several strategies for evaluating the effects of change along with managing change were reviewed. Specific strategies were identified but the

common theme centered around developing effective mechanisms to recognize the need for change, the speed at which the change needed to take place, developing key personnel to understand the change, and managing the communication process ensuring appropriate communications strategies were in place.

PROCEDURES

While attending the Executive Leadership course at the National Fire Academy in July 2006, the author of this ARP realized a large part of this course along with the discussion from the students in a formal classroom setting and in the informal setting focused on managing change within a fire department. In order to address the specific questions presented in the problem statement as well as providing specific background for the subject being addressed the author utilized the resources found at the Learning Resource Center (LRC) at the National Fire Academy to begin gathering information and literature to be reviewed.

Specific information focusing on human response to change along with effective change management processes were investigated at the LRC. A search of documents including published EFO applied research papers, pertinent documents, fire service texts, and trade journals were reviewed. Several sources of literature were found and reviewed however, very few items related to the specific subject matter of this ARP.

Upon returning home the author continued the literary search at the Appleton Public Library in August 2006. A search of relative sources was found at the Borders Book store in Grand Chute, Wisconsin resulting in the purchase of two textbooks related to the subject matter. Research was also conducted by completing a search on-line utilizing the Google search engine. Utilizing the Internet the author accessed several fire service and government related web sites such as www.firehouse.com, www.firechief.com, www.iafc.org, and www.icma.org. Utilizing

search words and phrases such as "change," "change management," "implementing change," etc, results in numerous websites, articles, and references, some of which were found to be useful and are cited.

During the research project the author of this ARP was working with the Grand Chute Town Administrator on evaluating organizations to implement an Employee Assistant Program for Town employees. During the interview of one perspective organization (Theda Care At Work, Appleton, Wisconsin) the author asked the sales person if there was an employee within their organization specializing in managing change. The sales person stated there was and provided the contact information needed.

An interview was scheduled with Heather Payette, MA, Corporate Consultant with Theda Care At Work. The interview was scheduled on October 20, 2006. Prior to the interview the author emailed the ARP proposal to Mrs. Payette so she would have time to evaluate the problem, purpose, and research questions. Since this research project required the use of surveys to evaluate the impact of change on personnel a draft of the survey instruments were also included in the email to Mrs. Payette. The intent of the interview was to further explain the research paper, gain insight on useful literature, receive feedback and recommendations on the survey drafts, and for the author to gain any other recommendations Mrs. Payette may have.

Two survey instruments were developed. The first survey instrument was developed in an effort to evaluate the impact of change on the personnel working at the GCFD. The second survey instrument was developed to evaluate if other fire departments of similar size are identifying the impacts of change among personnel and if so, what these departments are using to manage the change.

The first survey instrument was developed with the assistance of Mrs. Payette and distributed on October 21, 2006 to all 55 personnel on the department. A cover letter was included with the survey instrument explaining the reason and importance of the survey. The intent of this survey was to evaluate the impacts of change within the personnel of the GCFD. The respondents were given until November 6, 2006 to complete and hand in the completed survey. Throughout this time period the author continued to remind personnel during department training events, meetings, and after incidents to make sure and complete the surveys and continuously expressed the importance of the survey. This cover letter and survey is found in Appendix A of this paper.

On October 30, 2006 the second survey was mailed to 30 fire chiefs in the State of Wisconsin of similar size to that of GCFD. The 2006 Wisconsin State Fire Chief's Association Membership Directory was used to determine the appropriate departments as well as retrieving the appropriate mailing address for the fire chief of the respective departments.

A cover letter was included with the survey instrument explaining the reason and importance of the survey. The intent of this survey was to evaluate if other fire departments are identifying the human impact of change within their departments along with if these departments are using any type of instrument to manage change. The following thirty fire departments were mailed this survey:

- Germantown Fire Department
- Onalaska Fire Department
- Delafield Fire Department
- Two Rivers Fire Department
- Menomonie Fire Department

- Greenfield Fire Department
- DePere Fire Department
- New Berlin Fire Department
- Mequon Fire Department
- Town of Menasha Fire Department
- Allouez Fire Department
- Howard Fire Department
- Watertown Fire Department
- South Milwaukee Fire Department
- Caledonia Fire Department
- Kaukauna Fire Department
- Wisconsin Rapids Fire Department
- Menomonee Falls Fire Department
- Ashland Fire Department
- Beaver Dam Fire Department
- Cudahy Fire Department
- Fitchburg Fire Department
- Greendale Fire Department
- Middleton Fire Department
- Mount Pleasant Fire Department
- Pleasant Prairie Fire Department
- Stevens Point Fire Department
- Stoughton Fire Department

- Sun Prairie Fire Department
- Town of Madison Fire Department

Out of 30 fire departments surveyed, 18 (60%) completed and returned to the survey in the allotted time. The cover letter and survey is found in Appendix B of this paper.

The following are the limitations experienced in the completion of this ARP:

While utilizing the LRC at the NFA information on change, managing change, and identify the impacts of change was limited in the fire service journals, textbooks, and applied research papers.

When researching the subject of change management in relation to the corporate setting a wealth of information was found. This made it somewhat difficult to discern relative information pertaining to the research questions asked in this ARP. The interview completed with Mrs. Payette provided extremely beneficial to the author due to her ability to provide appropriate direction regarding useful literary text and research material.

Utilizing the Internet was beneficial however, when completing a search on Google, 100's of websites were identified. The limitation with most of these websites was the fact they usually included an enrollment including a fee to subscribe to their service. A number of the websites were private consulting firms charging for their services and provided very little information the author found useful.

The survey distributed to department personnel was lengthy (32 questions) and relied on the reader's ability to understand the question and respond appropriately. The first 23 questions related to the readers perception or feeling of department matters. The remaining 9 questions related to the individual and their perception as to how they personally feel about change within the GCFD. Actual responses to the survey are noted in the results section of this paper. It is also

assumed the answers the participants provided were accurate and true based on their assessment and perception of the questions.

RESULTS

The research produced a collection of data and information in support of the five questions pertaining to the ARP.

Research Question 1: What are the impacts of change among personnel of the GCFD?

In order to evaluate the impact of change among GCFD personnel a survey consisting of 32 questions broken into two parts was distributed to all personnel on the department. The first part of the survey addressed organizational change and the second part addressed the employee's personal relationship to change within the department. The author received assistance in the development of this survey during a personal interview with a corporate consultant. The goal of the survey was to gain insight relating to the impact of change on department personnel along with the views and opinions as related to change management within the department. The survey instrument was constructed primarily using a 4-point Likert scale. Of the 55 surveys distributed, 47 (85%) completed the survey within the allotted time.

The survey results are as follows:

Of the respondents 31 were paid-on-call (POC) firefighters. This represents 79% of the personnel on the department holding the rank of POC firefighter. All six of the POC officers (three Lieutenants, two Captains, and one Assistant Chief) completed the survey as well as all 10 of the full time staff (one Administrative Assistant, three Firefighters, two Lieutenants, one Captain, two Assistant Chiefs, and the Fire Chief). It should be noted at the time the survey was

distributed the department has an authorized total strength of 60 personnel. During this time period the department had a strength of 55 personnel.

1. The department has a good track record of managing change (historical)		
Strongly Disagree	9	(19%)
Disagree	15	(32%)
Agree	23	(49%)
Strongly Agree	0	(0%)
Overall Average Score	2.28	

The majority of the respondents (51%) agreed, some strongly the department does not have a good track record of managing change. Several interpretation issues are present with this question, one of which is the time personnel have been on the department and their perception of the historical track record. All but three (6%) of the respondents answered the "Years on the Department" demographic question on the survey. The breakdown of the remaining is as follows:

- 1 through 2 years: 11 (23%)
- 3 through 5 years: 8 (17%)
 - Under five years on the department: 19 (40%) total.
- 6 through 10 years: 10 (21%)
- 11 through 15 years: 6 (13%)
- 16 through 20 years: 3 (6%)
- 21 years and up: 6 (13%)

2. The department has a clear focus and sense of direction for the future.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	9	(19%)
Agree	33	(70%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.91	

3. Changes are made in a way that is consistent with the department's mission.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	3	(6%)
Agree	39	(83%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	3.04	
4. The leadership of the department is knowledgeable/up-to-date about strategic planning.		
Strongly Disagree	2	(4%)
Disagree	4	(9%)
Agree	24	(51%)
Strongly Agree	17	(36%)
Overall Average Score	3.19	
5. Change within the department is carefully considered and well planned.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	15	(32%)
Agree	28	(60%)
Strongly Agree	4	(8%)
Overall Average Score	2.76	
6. The leadership of the department is open to different ideas and opinions.		
Strongly Disagree	2	(4%)
Disagree	6	(13%)
Agree	20	(43%)
Strongly Agree	19	(40%)
Overall Average Score	3.19	
7. Employees are actively involved in planning and implementing change.		
Strongly Disagree	2	(4%)
Disagree	18	(38%)
Agree	23	(49%)
Strongly Agree	4	(9%)
Overall Average Score	2.62	
8. Personnel within the department share information with others.		
Strongly Disagree	8	(17%)
Disagree	19	(40%)
Agree	20	(43%)
Strongly Agree	0	(0%)
Overall Average Score	2.26	

The results from this question indicate the majority of the respondents 57% do not feel personnel share information with others. When this is broken done further 18 of the respondents was from the POC firefighter staff. This means over half (58%) of the POC firefighters that

responded indicated they feel personnel within the department do not share information with others. All but two of the POC officers agreed with this statement. The majority of the full time staff (70%) chose "Disagree" regarding this question.

9. The rationale for change is effectively communicated to employees.		
Strongly Disagree	8	(17%)
Disagree	11	(23%)
Agree	24	(51%)
Strongly Agree	4	(9%)
Overall Average Score	2.51	
10. Change at this department is driven by facts and information, rather than speculation or opinion.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(%)
Disagree	8	(17%)
Agree	34	(72%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.93	
11. The department rewards innovation and creativity.		
Strongly Disagree	8	(9%)
Disagree	13	(27%)
Agree	26	(55%)
Strongly Agree	4	(9%)
Overall Average Score	2.63	
12. In responding to change, the leadership of the department does a good job of keeping employees motivated.		
Strongly Disagree	6	(13%)
Disagree	20	(43%)
Agree	19	(40%)
Strongly Agree	2	(4%)
Overall Average Score	2.37	

The results from this question indicate the majority of the respondents 56% do not feel the leadership of the department does a good job of keeping employees motivated. When this is broken down further 16 of the respondents was from the POC firefighter staff. This means over half (52%) of the POC firefighters that responded indicated they feel the leadership of the department does not do a good job of keeping employees motivated. All but three (50%) of the POC officers agreed with this statement. Again, the majority of the full time staff (70%) chose "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" regarding this question. This question is difficult to interpret

due to the openness of the question. Exactly what does "the leadership" part of this question mean? There are currently 12 officers within the GCFD. This question deserves further follow up.

13. Employees receive adequate training to keep up with changes with the department.		
Strongly Disagree	2	(4%)
Disagree	8	(17%)
Agree	31	(66%)
Strongly Agree	6	(13%)
Overall Average Score	2.87	
14. Adequate resources are provided to accommodate new processes or standards.		
Strongly Disagree	7	(15%)
Disagree	10	(21%)
Agree	26	(55%)
Strongly Agree	4	(9%)
Overall Average Score	2.57	
15. The department monitors and evaluates the impact of changes that are made.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	13	(28%)
Agree	31	(66%)
Strongly Agree	3	(46%)
Overall Average Score	2.79	
16. Problems arising from change are systematically identified and resolved.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	14	(30%)
Agree	31	(66%)
Strongly Agree	2	(46%)
Overall Average Score	2.74	
17. Communication within the department keeps employees well informed about what is happening and what to expect.		
Strongly Disagree	11	(23%)
Disagree	17	(37%)
Agree	10	(21%)
Strongly Agree	9	(19%)
Overall Average Score	2.36	

The results from this question indicate the majority of the respondents 60% do not feel communication within the department keeps employees well informed. When this is broken

down further 19 of the respondents was from the POC firefighter staff. This means over half (61%) of the POC firefighters that responded indicated they feel personnel within the department do not share information with others. All but two of the POC officers agreed with this statement. The majority of the full time staff (70%) disagreed some strongly disagreeing with this question.

The written responses received from the respondents and noted later in this portion of the ARP highlights effective communication within the department as a weakness. Many of the responses have a direct reflection on the responses gained in this question.

18. The department consistently follows-through with plans and decisions.		
Strongly Disagree	2	(4%)
Disagree	10	(21%)
Agree	30	(64%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.81	
19. This department is perceived as innovative and progressive by other departments/organizations.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	12	(25%)
Agree	29	(62%)
Strongly Agree	6	(13%)
Overall Average Score	2.87	
20. The department celebrates its success in achieving positive change.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	17	(36%)
Agree	28	(60%)
Strongly Agree	2	(4%)
Overall Average Score	2.69	
21. The department supports change, calculated risk-taking within its culture.		
Strongly Disagree	2	(4%)
Disagree	6	(13%)
Agree	34	(72%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.89	

22. Given the current environment, the pace and scope of change at this department is appropriate.		
Strongly Disagree	7	(15%)
Disagree	13	(28%)
Agree	25	(53%)
Strongly Agree	2	(4%)
Overall Average Score	2.46	
23. Personnel can handle more change at the current rate at which change is occurring.		
Strongly Disagree	9	(19%)
Disagree	19	(40%)
Agree	14	(30%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.31	

In question #22 the majority of the responses (57%) indicated the current environment, the pace and scope of change at this department is appropriate. In question #23 the majority of the responses (59%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that personnel can handle more change at the current rate at which change is occurring. The respondents in this portion of the survey were asked their perception of organizational change. The responses from these questions related to what the respondent felt of the department and the personnel within the department.

The following questions (24-32) are individual responses related to the respondent's personal relationship to change within the department.

24 You perceive the department as innovative and progressive.		
Strongly Disagree	4	(9%)
Disagree	10	(21%)
Agree	23	(49%)
Strongly Agree	10	(21%)
Overall Average Score	2.83	
25. I find the speed at which changes occur within the department are manageable and within my scope.		
Strongly Disagree	7	(15%)
Disagree	9	(19%)
Agree	23	(49%)
Strongly Agree	8	(17%)
Overall Average Score	2.68	

The majority of respondents (66%) agreed or strongly agreed the speed at which changes occur within the department are manageable and within their scope. From the respondents that either disagreed or strongly disagreed (34%), 12 were from the POC firefighter ranks, one was from the POC officer ranks, and three were from the full time staff ranks. The 12 from the POC firefighter ranks represent 39% of the POC firefighters responding to the survey. Again, the written comments provided by some of the respondents highlight some of the issues surrounding this question.

26. I understand the reason for the changes.		
Strongly Disagree	2	(4%)
Disagree	10	(21%)
Agree	21	(45%)
Strongly Agree	14	(30%)
Overall Average Score	3	
27. I am overwhelmed by the changes that have occurred in the last two years.		
Strongly Disagree	10	(21%)
Disagree	22	(47%)
Agree	8	(17%)
Strongly Agree	7	(15%)
Overall Average Score	2.26	

From the respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with this statement 12 were POC firefighter, one was a POC officer, and two were from the full time staff. The 12 POC firefighters represented 25% of the total respondents to this question.

28. I feel the direction the department is heading is in the right direction.		
Strongly Disagree	0	(0%)
Disagree	5	(10%)
Agree	28	(60%)
Strongly Agree	14	(30%)
Overall Average Score	3.19	

29. I find it easy to balance the requirements placed upon me by the department.		
Strongly Disagree	8	(17%)
Disagree	11	(23%)
Agree	23	(49%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.53	

From the respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement 14 were POC firefighters, three were POC officers, and two were from full time staff. The 14 POC firefighters represented 30% of the total respondents to this question.

30. I feel I am informed and up-to-date with what is occurring in the department.		
Strongly Disagree	3	(6%)
Disagree	18	(38%)
Agree	21	(45%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.60	
31. I feel I am included in the change management process of the department.		
Strongly Disagree	5	(11%)
Disagree	15	(32%)
Agree	22	(46%)
Strongly Agree	5	(11%)
Overall Average Score	2.57	
32. I feel communication within the department is adequate and working well.		
Strongly Disagree	10	(21%)
Disagree	19	(41%)
Agree	16	(34%)
Strongly Agree	2	(4%)
Overall Average Score	2.21	

From the respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement 20 were POC firefighter, one was a POC officer, and 8 were from the full time staff. the 20 POC firefighters represented 43% of the total respondents to this question.

The following are the comments received on the department survey from the respondents. The comments were documented exactly as they were received and were not edited for grammatical correctness:

POC Firefighter Comments:

- Stuff rolls down hill, need good morale at the top tears. No benefit to being an officer, same pay, more hours, more responsibility, more controversy, it's not worth it. Most times in the work setting things are based off of seniority, granted certain people are more qualified than ones senior to them. Generally speaking seniority plays little to no role in our department. Training opportunities outside the area almost nonexistent, except for certain individuals. FVTC cannot teach everything. I see a problem with putting individuals in officer positions that don't even meet the SOG's rules for distance to stations, why do we even have SOG's?
- It is becoming to demanding being expected to spend so much time on fire department business leaving little time for regular jobs and family. It seems we are expected to live at the fire station. Fire Department Management needs to recognize the career and family needs of the POC members. It looks really bad to some full time people working 3-day weeks having so much time to spend with family when POC members don't have that.
- The training within the department has changed a lot. For the most part I like the training and I think its been good. I look forward for the training to continue to grow and become great. I would like to know why we have to do things over and over again though? Seems like there would be a lot we could train on.
- I see communication within the department as the biggest missing link. The only way I find out about stuff is to talk with someone working during the day, and then they put

their own spin on it. It would be nice if my officer or the station officer would take a little time and bring me up to speed on things.

- I am being expected to spend more time at the station and higher standards on training. I don't know how I am supposed to do this along with spending time with my family and work. I understand for the most part why this is needed but the way it was worked for a long time.
- I feel some of the officers don't keep the stream of communications open. Example: I never heard anything about the SWOT analysis from my officer. In fact, since I have been there when the officer I have been assigned to has not communicated much of anything to me. We should be reviewing incidents of significance that occur.
- We need to build on working as a team, as a department, not days vs. nights or FT vs. PT. I think it goes back to training. Honestly I don't know the training levels of a lot of members of Station Two. I am not sure I would be comfortable with someone I hardly know or hardly worked with, on a hoseline with me. I know everyone has had FF2. We all know classroom is different than real life. Every one of us should be able to look at firefighter X and say I am 100% comfortable with you on a hoseline with me. That's not the case. This I think will help bring us together as a team. I have more training but that's my main issue.
- Why do we have to work with firefighters that don't come to training, incidents, or meetings?
- Things need to be put to rest before it all becomes rumors and no one knows what is real. I think meetings should be known by everyone so if they want to see first hand what is

going on they can. It may just be to listen but a fresh set of ears may bring new ideas later down the road.

- Communication through all ranks down to firefighter is vital in any organization. It is not always easy to balance everything but it is a commitment I have made to serve my committee.
- Reasons for change are not clearly communicated "turn in badges - we are not using them anymore." Why?
- This department needs to be more concerned on how our officers are chosen. Within the last two years officers were asked to resign and Hortonville firefighter should no be an officer. Future planning for this department is very important. The chief takes the lead, but some officers are not following.
- Communication, communication, communication. Where are the officers? My officer doesn't speak to me at all. I am forced to not use the chain of command if need something. The only way I find out about stuff is by reading the updates and email. I often find out about stuff after the fact.
- I feel change is good sometimes and that we as a department are going in a good direction and it's a good place to work. But I also feel that sometimes with the way respond to some calls with TMFD and are own POC members are not needed - its all the duty crew. With communication I don't know sometimes what is going on until it's a couple of weeks past when it happens or don't know at all.
- Policies are being changed to fast/to many. I feel our department struggles to maintain required state mandated training, let alone do training that is innovative and progressive. I feel that changes made within the department are upper management motivated and

have little to do with the wants or needs of lower echelon personnel. Operational, procedural and managerial changes have occurred at a rate I believe are overwhelming to personnel who already have full time jobs and families. I think there is still a mindset that full-time union personnel are king shit in the station and paid on call members are tolerated. I do think updates to equipment and apparatus have been phenomenal and that staffing issues are trying to be addressed in the best, most timely manner.

- It appears decisions are made with input from management and full time employees and POC personnel are told what the changed decisions are. The lack of interests in having a GCFD ambulance. We seem to tolerate substandard care by Gold Cross and allow them to use our facilities with out paying adequate rent and utilities.

I also see an ongoing lack of respect for POC's assigned to station two. Some are very open in referring to as a 2nd class location. I am proud of station two and try to respond to as many calls as I can, yet very often are not needed, that's okay - but I don't appreciate being told "oh we haven't seen you for a long time."

- I feel that the communication coming from the top is very informative, when we all are able to review it. But I feel if something comes from the top and down through the officer ranks to the firefighters, it seems to get lost or given with a marginal time frame to finish a possible task or assignment. I don't want to say that although some things are considered stressors and are unnecessary, I still feel very fortunate to be part of this department and especially to say that I am very proud to be a firefighter. I also look forward to the future of this department and hope that I can be looked to for a larger role within the department.

- The impacts of change on the personnel of the Grand Chute Fire Department depend on the individual. Overall, however, these past few years have brought a lot of change to our fire department. We have had a new Chief, Training Chief, new department practices and requirements. We have had officer's resign, leave or step down to another rank. New leaders have had to step up. We have hired many new personnel, new drivers, and many new pieces of apparatus.

Through it all, we have embraced and grown with these changes to be a better department. We have also enacted a mutual aid pact with a neighboring department that automatically sends a piece of staffed apparatus for certain calls in certain parts of the town and we in turn send an apparatus to their calls. This has given each department the added support that each needs.

All of these changes, I feel have had a positive impact on the personnel of the department. We see that this department is looking forward to the future. To be sure that we are current with technology and having to keep our community as safe and secure as possible.

The change of management process that would be most effective to improve the outcome and manage change in our department would be to continue doing what we have been.

Currently, we assign groups, officers, and the department as a whole to embrace all changes and offer suggestions about the change before and during the change to make sure everyone has a voice. Through policy committee, everyone can go to a member of the committee and offer ideas about new policies or current policies.

Officers have been assigned to be in control of each station and report to the Chief officers. If personnel have concerns, questions, or suggestions - the key is proper use of the chain of command. Sorry for the scribbles, my computer is not working.

- Good Stuff: In the past couple of years we have seen some movement with the department as far as change. Not all of it has been good, but most has. Regarding some the "bad" change I have seen the Chief change his mind on a change that may not have been a good thing and have him reverse it or modify the change to something more tolerable. I like the way the officer ranks have been restructured. I have an assigned supervisor and I know who to go to - I will also mention this in the "bad" part below too. Our apparatus and equipment is excellent and the full time staff in charge of this stuff is doing a great job keeping this all together. I don't know how they do it but they do and I personally appreciate the job they do to keep us in good stuff.

Bad Stuff: I see two very bad things that really piss me off when it comes to this department. The first one is our officers. Even though I have an assigned officer I don't think this person has ever instigated a conversation with me or the others at this station regarding what's going on in the department unless its on of his buddies. I think we have a few (very few) good officers in the POC ranks - The majority of the POC officers do not deserve the position. They talk bad about the department when "brass" is not around, they circumvent the chief and chief officers and do NOT support what is coming from administration. These officers do more damage to the department and change within the department then anything else. If the department wants to see some positive change get rid of the officers that are doing this stuff and promote people that will do the job of an officer. As a firefighter I should rely on my officer to make sure I know what is

going on, get the rest of the story and so on. I knew the SWOT analysis was happening because I read the Communication Update. I also read in that Communication Update that the Chief had instructed the officers to talk with their assigned firefighters. My Lieutenant (if you can call him that) didn't say anything to me at all and I am a firefighter that is always around this place participating in a lot. I guess my officer doesn't think much of me or my opinion.

The second bad thing is our Town Board not recognizing the fire department needs to support and protect this community. In my opinion the only thing the Town Board is concerned about is how to keep themselves in a position. One of these days something really bad is going to happen in this Town and the fire department is not going to be able to provide the protection needed to save lives. Of course if that happens I am sure they (the Board) will blame us.

- Want to see some positive change? Get rid of the POC officers that should not be in the position they are in. OR provide some level of accountability so the officers do their job regarding communicating with us, training us, or passing the buck to another officer.
- I love working here as a POC firefighter. I think the full time staff is very helpful in the day-to-day stuff that goes on. I may not know everything they are involved with but I know they are very busy. Even when they are busy they will often take the time to help me with what I need. Seems like one or two of the full time guys are pretty moody and negative a lot. I like to think its because they are busy and have a lot on their plate. It would be nice if there were not so much of the full time vs. POC mentality - we are one department. The POC personnel cannot help it if there aren't more full time personnel

we are just doing our job too. I am a POC that wants to see more full time personnel because with the size of this town there should be.

- The POC officers need to be more supportive of the department along with communicating more to us. My officer just tells me to do something or he doesn't tell me anything at all.

POC Officer Comments:

Question 1: Historically, this department has not managed change well. However, in the last three years change management has improved and continues to improve as each change is implemented.

Question 2: With the current strategic plan, I believe we need to post established time lines with each objective that is measurable and the objective should be reviewed with the leadership (all officers) annually and revised as needed.

Question 8: We as a department need to improve on information sharing, specifically, sharing the same message consistently and timely.

Question 12: The leadership (all officers) needs to improve on team building and motivational exercises.

Question 14: Specific training and sufficient time needs to be allotted to each change that affects all personnel. Measurable objectives should also be included. If the resources cannot be allotted to the change, the change should not occur.

Question 23: At this time, personnel are at different stages of each change. Some know why when and how while others are still just learning of the change. Until all personnel achieve the same level of being informed and adapting to each change, short-term changes should be closely evaluated.

- General Comments: My personal opinion is as it relates to this department and the leadership does not vary a great deal. I believe that in the last three years this department has endured significant change, which as a whole has improved our level of service to our customers. Internally, I think we can do much better as it relates to personnel communication, personnel evaluations, and looking at what we do best and encouraging positive behavior and commitment.
- To many changes coming to fast! Not saying that most are not good changes but sometimes its difficult to keep up on all the new things going on (good or bad). I don't feel some of the changes always have the input from the people it will affect.
- I think there are some area of the department where the leadership needs more training especially in the areas of change management and planning.
- It would be nice to see my fellow officers support the department more than they are. We seem to struggling with communicating and working together on getting stuff done.

Full Time Staff Comments:

Additional Comments:

- 1: Communications between Company Officer and line firefighters needs to improve.
2. Firefighters need to be held accountable for keeping themselves in the communication loop and utilizing the communication vehicles that are being used for dispersing information i.e.: Email.
3. I think that at times some of our Company Officers use information as a "tool of power" basically sharing information under their terms.

4: Organizational Change is always difficult in Fire Departments, but I think change and subsequently dealing with change is a little harder with our department due to a couple of factors, those being:

- In our membership demographics we have a lot of young inexperienced firefighters.
- At present I don't feel our Company Officers are up to where they need to be with leadership skills.
- In general dealing with growth statement I think we have a wide range of positions on change through out our department, that is some members feel we are moving to fast and some members feel we are not moving fast enough, this inherently will cause conflict. Dealing with this change I believe is really a matter of leadership, that is the leaders Chiefs/Company Officers are proactive, lead by example and show unity conflict will be minimal.
- Change is different for everybody. The department historically was somewhat stagnant for years with change. In the last 3-1/2 years there has been radical change with 1 chief and a more paced change with the current administration.
- As a result of perception or lack of communication in the POC/Part-Time/Casual ranks there is a perceived threat to their existence, "NOT" true.
- Changes made with the Comm. Center are getting more and more confusing. Change is good and bad. It's hard to understand a lot of change in a short period of time. We have gone through three chief's in the last 5-6 years. It takes time to build a relationship and an understanding of the direction each individual would like to lead us. I feel the department is going in the right direction. It's just going to take time for everyone to get on board. Do this same survey a year from now.

- Question 1: It seems that the department would issue a change but see it through entirely. We still do not have a procedure to evaluate change that I am aware of.
- Question 3: We are not providing enough "fast, effective, and efficient emergency response activities along with proactive community risk reduction services.
- Question 6: Certain Chief Officer(s) and Company Officer(s) are seemingly very opposed to change. Some things I have proposed to improve the FD have not been acted on.
- Question 7: It seems to me that there is a fair amount of "this is the way it will be done" going on.
- Question 8: Always a classic problem. I don't get all my information from rumors but I get more information from them than some officers.
- Question 11: The department does not really reward anyone other than Fire officer and Firefighter of the year and anyone else they really want to feel good. Truck committee chair/valuable employee/customer service.
- Question 12: It seems like here it is now deal with it.
- Question 13: The employees receive it whether they take it all in is another story.
- Question 15: No change review committee. We have a smoke detector policy that I do not believe is being followed. What should we do about that?
- Question 16: See smoke detector policy above.
- Question 17: Communication from Chief Farley quite good. Communication from Chief Trilling good. Communication from all others leaves something to be desired.
- Question 18: Seems to be much hemming and hawing. Could be based on budget constraints.
- Question 19: We are still the backwards department yet they seem to want to mimic us.
- Question 20: Lets have a change party sometime.

- Question 21: To many people afraid of change.
- Question 22: We are becoming complacent and stagnant.
- Question 23: Personnel could handle much more - change is slow.
- Question 24: Department seems to be spinning wheels but going nowhere.
- Question 25: Change is almost too slow for the amount we need to change.
- Question 26: They are clearly communicated.
- Question 27: Hard to be overwhelmed by so few and somewhat minor changes.
- Question 28: Change due to recent budget changes/shifts.
- Question 29: Workload is great but manageable.
- Question 30: Not as much as I could be.
- Question 31: Being on the policy committee is a plus.
- Question 32: Refer to question and answer to #17.

Research Question 2 and 3: What, if any are other departments of similar size using to identify the impacts of change among department personnel? What, if any are other departments of similar size using to manage change within their organizations?

In order to address these two ARP questions a survey consisting of four questions (Appendix B) was mailed to 30 fire chiefs from similar sized fire departments within the State of Wisconsin. The first two questions on the survey addressed the question # 2 of this ARP. Questions #3 and #4 address the second question of this ARP.

The goal of this survey was to find out if other departments are formally evaluating the impact of change on department personnel and if so, find out what they are using to evaluate this. Additionally, the goal of this survey was to find out if other departments are using or have adopted a formal process, program, procedure, or instrument to assist in managing change within

their department. Of the thirty cover letters and surveys mailed, 18 (60%) were completed and mailed back within the allotted time.

The survey results are as follows:

Question 1: Within your department have you identified the impact of change among your personnel?

Out of the 18 responding chief officers, 14 (78%) responded to this question by circling "yes" the remaining 4 (22%) circled "No."

Question 2: If your response was "yes" what did you use to identify the impact of change among your personnel?

The following are the received responses, documented exactly as they were written:

1. Open management concept
2. Levels of formal education
 - In 2003, the number of personnel who were enrolled in college and/or who had as a minimum an Associates Degree was 15% (5/33).
 - In 2006, the number of personnel who were enrolled in college and/or who had as a minimum and Associates Degree was 45% (15/33).

Levels of certification

- In 2003, the number of personnel who had at least two state certifications (Firefighting and/or EMS related) was 45% (15/33).
 - In 2006, the number of personnel who had at least two state certifications (Firefighting and/or EMS related) was 91% (30/33)
3. The biggest problem we see in our combination full time/part time/POC department would involve change in protocols (both fire/EMS). It is hard to keep all members up to

par when a portion of our staffing aren't very active whether it is training or protocols or SOG's. Most people deal with change here quite well but there is a select few that always reject it, even if it is better.

4. Personal observance and performance appraisals.
5. Monitor personnel response, discussion sessions, calculated solicitation of member opinion and input. Evaluating the success/failure of new programs.
6. Evaluating impacts - I follow Covey's four roles of leadership plus the seven habits. It has worked well.
7. Observation to changes in response procedures, changes in policy, changes in rules.
Observations to monitor our acceptance or if need for additional training or modification to policy is needed.
8. Personnel that accept change are successful in their careers and are able to adapt to their work environment as well personnel that resist change don't report for duty and have poor attendance. Positive impact equals good attendance and buy in.
9. Rumors, the more rumors and further from the truth the more change is going on.
10. By using past years, I find that amount of training required is greater. Commitment of personnel has changed also, people are looking at how this will benefit them.
11. When a change is made we have shift meetings to go over the change and what is expected.
12. Quality of criticism and level of buy in.
13. Some matters are evident by financial impact. Self evidence - Employee/employer input, direct communication and feedback also through committee structure. Results expected

and evaluated to measure impact all based on positive/negative outcomes. Long range planning proving positive.

14. Crew meetings periodically throughout the year. OPM = Organizational Climate Meetings between management and union on a monthly basis. State of the department address twice per year. Organizational climate survey annually. Open communication.

Question #3: Do you feel your department is effectively managing change?

Out of the 18 responding chief officers, 14 (78%) responded to this question by circling "Yes" three (16%) circled "No" and one respondent (6%) did not answer this question.

Question #4: If your response was "yes" what does your department use to manage change (formal process, program, procedure, instrument, etc.)?

The following are the received responses, documented exactly as they were written:

1. Same as #2, more committees and involved in department operations.
2. **Management Philosophy:** Firefighters will assume ownership of their positions when they are permitted to exhibit professional and personal interests in improving the department and performance.

Leadership Style: Based on the values of trust, teamwork, and continuous improvement. It is built around the principles of developing a feeling of ownership and sharing it with those who execute the work, creating an environment of pride, fostering a learning environment which encourages others to grow and progress.

Management Philosophy + Leadership Style: By employing this management philosophy and leadership style, the entire fire protection team becomes responsible for organizational learning and improvement.

- People rise to the challenge when it is their challenge.

- If we want them to act like it's their business, then we must make it their business.
- Today the tools of production are the ideas and talents, *the intellectual capital*, of the people within organizations.
- As a team, we must develop and communicate
 - A clear vision (common purpose) of where we want to be in five years
 - The tasks involved in getting us there
 - Our individual responsibilities

Managing Change: Manage strategy is to manage change.

- Transformation begins with recognition that new paths must be explored
- Vision + action = Change

Strategic Planning:

- 2010 Strategic Staffing Plan produced the need for an additional 7 full time positions between 2004 and 2010. **Results** - 1 F/T position in 2004; 1 F/T position in 2006; and 1 F/T position approved for 2007.
- Vehicle Replacement Strategic Plan identified the replacement of all major and support apparatus by year groups: **Results** - 100' Aerial in 2004; Mid-Size Rescue in 2005; Wildland Brush in 2006; and Fire Prevention SUV/Command Vehicle approved for 2007.
- Equipment Replacement Strategic Plan identified needed replacements over five years: **Results** - 30 sets of PPE in 2003-2006 (10 sets per year); 3 PPV fans in 2004-2006 (1 per year); 4 high end ventilation saws in 2004-2005 (2 per year of each type); and auto-extrication hydraulic equipment approved for 2007.

- Information Management Plan identified needed replacements over five years:
Results - Standardized 16 radio channels on all portables, mobiles, and base stations to improve interoperability; 6 new low band portable radios; award of 2006 Fire Act Grant for \$65,000 to complete converting communications to comply with APCO-25 narrow band standard.
 - Basic and Advanced Career Progression Plan: **Results** - In 2006, developed a highly visible and attainable two-tier (basic and advanced) career progression plan for Firefighter, Driver/Operator, Fire Officer, Fire Investigator, and Public Educator.
 - Job Descriptions - Upgraded all full time and part time job descriptions to include the appropriate level of certifications: **Results** - Full time Firefighter minimum requirements increased from FF I and EMT-B to FF I, FF II, Hazardous Material Technician, and EMT-B.
3. Formal monthly trainings and training requirements. Examples: EMT-P training, fire training, officer meetings, monthly or bi-monthly newsletters, and daily email tree updates to all members.
 4. A culture/philosophy document. To answer this question truthfully I would say "questionable." We've maintained somewhat of a status quo even though we've recently went through several internal re-organizational processes. We are currently struggling with "generational differences" new employees exhibit. We are looking for ways to embrace our culture.
 5. Special committees, special meetings, planning sessions, continuous evaluation, and group involvement.
 6. Again, using the four roles and seven habits. I also subscribe to Six Sigma.

7. We use an open line of communication. Better known as participatory management.
Change is introduced, discussed, modified, and implemented. Change comes slow but it has been effective with limited problems.
8. This is the most effective fire department in managing change. It went from the largest volunteer non-profit corporate fire department splintered into five subgroups into a municipal fire department in two years. Believe me private volunteer fire department don't like change. The result is I'm still here, they are gone and the service has moved forward at an unbelievable pace.
9. Strategic planning, committee to provide suggestions/buy in, surveys.
10. In an informal way we bring in those effected for their input prior to the change.
11. Changes are published in department. Feedback is encouraged with required solution proposals.
12. Solicit participation and management input → output. Ownership of concept through implementation.
13. Open discussion involving department needs, employee needs. Discuss with bargaining unit and typically create sub-committee to search for positive results. Keep focus on community. Proposed plans/programs, leadership and follow through as discussed and agreed on. Continue with feedback evaluation process, careful planning and training with an emphasis on needed change. Typically quite successful.
14. Refer to OCM (organizational climate meetings), in addition we have Department Leadership Meetings (DLM) each month to measure the impact of change and strategically forecast the future.

15. Use of committees, advisory groups. Listen to suggestions from those performing the work. We do not have a formalized process or procedure.

Research Question 4: What are recommended strategies or processes for managing change within a fire department?

Throughout the research process of this paper along with information gained from the survey instruments one common theme continues to surface regarding management of change within an organization - Communication. Almost all of the literature indicated in some manner that understanding and implementing effective communication channels is required to effectively manage the change process within an organization. Another common theme is managers must understand the people within an organization. Managers must understand the basic needs of people within the organization, throughout all levels of the organization. Employee motivation is dictated by physical and psychological needs, the ability of the employer to fulfill unsatisfied needs, once this is achieved another need in the hierarchy can be achieved. Often times these needs can be addressed through effective communication and an understanding of how important the communication process is when addressing the needs of employees.

During the literature review it became evident there was not an abundant amount of information available regarding change management within fire service organizations. There were several EFO abstracts relating to change within the author's specific organizations however, the topic usually focused on one particular change within that specific organization and not focused on managing overall organizational change.

The results of the survey sent to the fire chiefs of similar sized departments around the State of Wisconsin indicated in many instances a formal strategy or process was not used within their departments. Many of the Chiefs responding to the survey provided feedback citing

communication was the key to effectively managing change within their departments. The research indicates that with fire departments of similar size to GCFD a formal strategy or process is not used to manage change.

Research Question 5: What change management processes would be most effective to improve the outcome and effectively manage change within the GCFD?

The amount of information gained in the literature review and research completed resulted in numerous examples of how change is managed within organizations. A component to managing change is the ability to influence others. Unit 8 - Introduction to Influencing taught in the Executive Leadership course provides a conceptual model of the dynamics of influencing others. The algorithm provided provides a useful instrument to assist in influencing others and does apply conceptually to many of the change management processes reviewed. However, influencing is a part of the change management process.

Change is often disruptive and understanding the effects of change on personnel is an important first step in effectively dealing with change management within an organization. As reflected in the Change Management Curve, personnel progress with change in a series of phases. The first phase begins with status quo until the change begins to occur. When the change begins, there is a turn downward into a zone that consists of heightened stress, uncertainty, upheaval, and diminished productivity. As acceptance of the change takes place there is a climb up the other side of the curve as personnel regain a sense of direction, learn new skills and roles, and begin to work in a new way.

This curve known as change management curve consists of four phases. Personnel will move through these four phases at varying speeds. Complete mastery of the change involves transition through each of the four phases - Denial, Resistance, Exploration, and

Commitment. Even while moving through the four phases it is common to have personnel to move back to a previous phase or become stuck in one of the phases. Eventually for change to be successful organizationally and individually personnel must move through all the phases.

During any change within an organization there will be a period of adjustment in which anxiety and uncertainty increase. This period is accompanied by a corresponding decrease in efficiency, performance, and potentially moral. Personnel who are prepared to deal with change will be able to anticipate, plan, and accelerate the change process. Managers must understand the impact change has on personnel and develop an understanding role as personnel move through the various phases.

In *The Fire Chief's Handbook*, Sixth Edition (2003) the author of chapter 6, Dennis Compton provides insight in relation to how leaders provide direction to employees in a way that encourages innovation, empowerment, and change. Four organizational anchors are provided defining expectations, clarity, and keep employees focused on moving forward together. As stated in this chapter the four organizational anchors are:

1. A clearly defined mission and clear customer expectations.
2. Shared organizational values and an understanding of the organizational culture.
3. Well managed financial resources.
4. Appropriate levels of training; organizational policies; realistic and complete standard operating procedures; and definitive strategic and operational plans.

A common business practice used throughout corporate America is Total Quality Management (TQM) introduced by Edward Deming. TQM is a system of continuous improvement employing participative management and centered on the needs of the customer. The key components of TQM are employee involvement and training, problem solving teams,

statistical methods, long-term goals and thinking, and recognition that the system, not people, produces inefficiencies. Deming outlined 14 steps that managers in any type of organization can make to implement TQM.

An additional tool derived from TQM is The Deming Cycle otherwise known as Plan, Do Study, and Act. This model is used for the continuous improvement within an organization and requires managers to plan ahead for change, execute plans, study the results, and then take action to standardize or improve upon the process.

As in the fire service many large businesses learn from the mistakes they have made in the past or learn from critical mistakes made from other businesses. Often times businesses in the corporate world make fundamental changes in response to changes made within their industry or a more challenging market environment. Many times changes we see in the corporate setting fail and most often the reason for the failure is due to not fully understanding the change process or skipping critical steps in an effort to speed up the process. Kotter (2006) provides eight common errors made in the corporate world when managing change. Additionally, Kotter also provides eight steps to successfully transform an organization in an effort to assist with the change management process.

The literature review and research completed for this ARP produced numerous examples, "best practices," models, techniques, tools, and theories to incorporate within the GCFD to effectively manage change. Most, if not all the examples are cyclical and involve numerous steps. All of the examples reviewed require effective organizational communication to ensure the success of enacting the change management process.

DISCUSSION

The research and literature review completed for this ARP is in line with the purpose and five questions asked in the introduction. The focus of the research was evaluating the impact of change on department personnel along with change management strategies. The GCFD struggles to maintain a balance within the organization relating to change. The research conducted revealed the fact that the impact of change on personnel and managing change is an organizational concern of private business as well.

Recognizing the importance to change for a defined reason is critical within an organization. Once the reason has been defined a process to manage the change is equally important. Kotter (2006) states "the change process goes through a series of phases that, in total, usually requires a considerable length of time. Skipping steps creates only the illusion of speed and never produces a satisfying result." Kotter further recommends eight steps to transforming an organization:

1. Establishing a sense of urgency
 - a. Examining market and competitive realities.
 - b. Identifying and discussing crises, potential crises, or major opportunities.
2. Forming a powerful guiding coalition
 - a. Assembling a group with enough power to lead the change effort.
 - b. Encouraging the group to work together as a team.
3. Creating a vision
 - a. Creating a vision to help direct the change effort.
 - b. Developing strategies for achieving that vision.

4. Communicating the vision
 - a. Using every vehicle possible to communicate the new vision and strategies.
 - b. Teaching new behaviors by the example of the guiding coalition.
5. Empowering others to act on the vision
 - a. Getting rid of obstacles to change.
 - b. Changing systems or structures that seriously undermine the vision.
 - c. Encouraging risk taking and nontraditional ideas, activities, and actions.
6. Planning for and creating short-term wins
 - a. Planning for visible performance improvements.
 - b. Creating those improvements.
 - c. Recognizing and rewarding employees involved in the improvements.
7. Consolidating improvements and producing still more change
 - a. Using increased credibility to change systems, structures, and policies that don't fit the vision.
 - b. Hiring, promoting, and developing employees who can implement the vision.
 - c. Reinvigorating the process with new projects, themes, and change agents.
8. Institutionalizing new approaches
 - a. Articulating the connections between the new behaviors and corporate success.
 - b. Developing the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

Many of the models evaluated throughout the research included processes that are cyclical and involve steps much like Kotter's eight steps to transforming an organization. Kotter cautions making changes within an organization just for change sake. There must be a distinct reason for the change and then the change process must be effectively managed and evaluated.

The number of steps involved with the various change management processes varied however, a common step strategy was evident and involved analysis, planning, implementing, and evaluating. An additional common theme with all of the change management processes involved communication with employees and involving the employees in all of the steps identified.

Deming (2000) produced 14 points in an effort to implement TQM. "Define your mission/vision/goal, aim for constant improvement in the product or service you offer your clients. You cannot do this without maintaining a high level of motivation and satisfaction in the people that comprise your organization." All levels of the organization must be involved, starting with full commitment from management and supervisory staff. Avoid unsettling changes without involving the whole team and utilize the following 14 steps:

1. Create constancy of purpose for improvement of product and service. Constancy of purpose requires innovation, investment in research and education, continuous improvement of product and service, maintenance of equipment, and new aids to production.
2. Adopt the new philosophy. Management must undergo a transformation and begin to believe in quality products and services.
3. Cease dependence on mass inspection. Inspect products and services only enough to be able to identify ways to improve the process.
4. End the practice of awarding business on price tag alone. The lowest priced goods are not always the highest quality; choose a supplier based on its record of improvement and then make a long-term commitment to it.

5. Improve constantly and forever the system of product and service. Improvement is not a one-time effort. Management is responsible for leading the organization into the practice of continual improvement in quality and productivity.
6. Institute training and retraining. Workers need to know how to do their jobs correctly even if they need to learn new skills.
7. Institute leadership. Leadership is the job of management. Managers have the responsibility to discover the barriers that prevent staff from taking pride in what they do. The staff will know what those barriers are.
8. Drive out fear. People often fear reprisal if they make waves at work. Managers need to create an environment where workers can express concerns with confidence.
9. Break down barriers between staff areas. Managers should promote teamwork by helping staff in different areas/departments work together. Fostering interrelationships among department encourages higher quality decision-making.
10. Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for the workforce. Using slogans alone, without investigation into the processes of the workplace, can be offensive to workers because they imply that a better job could be done. Managers need to learn real ways of motivating people in their organizations.
11. Eliminate numerical quotas. Quotas impede quality more than any other working condition. They leave no room for improvement. Workers need the flexibility to give customers the level of service they need.
12. Remove barriers to pride of workmanship. Give workers respect and feedback about how they are doing their jobs.

13. Institute a vigorous program of education and retraining. With continuous improvement, job descriptions will change. As a result, employees need to be educated and retrained so they will be successful at new job responsibilities.
14. Take action to accomplish the transformation. Management must work as a team to carry out the previous 13 steps.

In many ways the 14 steps apply to a fire department while trying to manage change. Deming's 14 steps were published to assist organizations to implement TQM. Many organizations have adopted TQM and implemented the 14 steps into the workplace. Deming instituted a process for continuous improvement and learning. The process consisting of a logical sequence of four repetitive steps "Plan, Do, Study, and Act." The "Deming Cycle" is often implemented in daily routine management for individuals or teams, problem solving process, project management, continuous development, human resource development and/or training, new product services development, to evaluate new processes and includes the following:

1. Plan: Plan ahead for change. Analyze and predict the results.
2. Do: Execute the plan, taking small steps in controlled circumstances.
3. Study: Study and evaluate the results.
4. Act: Take action to standardize or improve the process.

Currently, the GCFD does not follow a standardized approach to manage change. Change is occurring, and at times the change is rapid and significantly impacts personnel. This is evident from the results of the department personnel survey. The survey was developed to assess the views personnel held relating to their perception of change management within the department and the impact that change has on them. The 32-question survey completed by a

total of 47 personnel revealed a slightly less than average on the majority of the questions asked. The overall average scores indicated at the current time change is being managed, however improvements need to be made, problems do exist and need to be addressed. The questions in the survey with the lowest average scores indicating a solid disagreement with the question related to communication, involvement in the change process and planning, and the historical track record the department has with managing change. Many of the written comments provided by department personnel indicated communication among supervisory personnel to subordinate personnel was ineffective and in some cases failing.

While conducting the literature review every source consistently identified two important aspects of managing change. The first was change must be planned for and managed. The second was effective communication with personnel is critical. Everyone views change in a different way. If change seems like a threat, then personnel will tend to respond as if it is a real threat. Likewise, if change looks like a natural process of growth and development, personnel will approach change accordingly. The impact of change also depends on the past experiences personnel have with change. As reflected in the response in the survey most personnel with the department indicated the department has a history of managing change poorly.

The real difficulty in mastering change lies in the fact that people have a difficult time programming themselves to adjust. Add to this the fact that often time's managers and employees view change differently. The impact of change can lead to physical, emotional, and at times mental distress that can influence job performance. Strebel (2006) stresses the importance of employees and management making mutual commitments, both stated and implied that define their relationship. The formal commitment is stated in job performance and formally

adopted in job descriptions or performance expectations. The commitment though comes into fruition through communication.

Proper communication is a key to leading change however, within the GCFD change may be communicated through channels it's not always reaching all employees. More importantly, a standard organizational change management model is not being utilized and the officers of the department and at times only the chiefs of the department are deciding upon change. When change is communicated to department members the method used is typically the easiest such as through email, department newsletter, or memos. Officer meetings are usually held once a month, and are closed meetings to anyone except officers. Meetings occur frequently in the work setting and many times these meetings are held behind closed doors creating an environment of exclusion.

Employee fear becomes the ever-present fabric when people in positions of authority are suddenly behind closed doors, speak in hushed tones to other leaders, communicate primarily via memos and emails, and refuse to address rumors head-on (Glaser, 2006). Indirect communication sends a very direct message to employees, you're not included, and this creates harmful fear as stated by Glaser (2006):

- Lack of shared focus, purpose, and vision.
- Lack of communication that opens the door for paranoia.
- Lack of personal communication and, consequently, a lack of positive contribution.
- Lack of respect for others within the organization, thus causing resentment and undermining authority.
- Failure to tap a person's unique inner talent and creativity, which causes deeper isolation and fear.

- Failure to develop team agreements, strategies, and decision-making policies.
- A self-serving approach on the part of management.
- Negativity and complaining, which are both the cause and effect of fear.
- Low morale because of leadership's unwillingness to share the truth.

Most of the like-sized departments surveyed for this research indicated they evaluate the impact of change on personnel and provided examples informal in nature. Additionally, the responses received indicated that most do not have a formal process of managing change within their departments. Until the research was conducted for this ARP the impact of change on GCFD personnel had never been conducted and a formal process or standard for implementing change is not utilized within the department or the Town. The result of this is an inconsistent manner in which change is communicated and accepted with the department and is creating inconsistencies in job performance, confusion, and frustration among department personnel.

The research conducted for this ARP revealed there is a negative impact on personnel relating to the manner in which change is managed within the department. The results of the department survey revealed the fact that at the present time the majority of the respondents are managing this impact however, there is room for improvement. The research also provided a wide variety of formal change management processes and tools that can be implemented. When evaluating other fire departments it became apparent they are struggling with similar problems.

As stated in the problem statement of this ARP "The problem is the GCFD is experiencing rapid change that will continue and there hasn't been a study on the impact these changes are having on personnel." During the period the author worked on this ARP significant department changes occurred in the area of personnel, technology, stations, and staffing. The impact of these changes is becoming more evident on personnel. The research and information

gathered supports the development and implementation of effective change management processes and strategies focusing on improved communication, planning, and inclusion of personnel in decision-making creating an atmosphere of trust and buy-in. Failure to recognize the impact change is having on personnel and the lack of formal change management process will lead to poor morale, continued loss of personnel (employee turnover), frustration, inconsistencies in job performance, and ultimately poor service delivery.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this research are consistent with the information gained from the review of researched material and surveys. Completing this ARP required the author to take a look deep within the GCFD and evaluate what kind of impact changes have on personnel and then complete the research to find out how we as an organization can make improvements. Change and the speed at which change occurs is constant within private business and the fire service is just as susceptible to the impact and the associated organizational pressures. The fire service has started to learn lessons from each other in areas such as firefighter safety. This thought holds true with what the fire service can learn from private business and their lessons learned with minimizing the impact of change and managing change.

The GCFD as an organization is no exception and must realize the importance of this subject matter. Failure to recognize the impact of change on personnel and more importantly the failure to adopt a standard tool or organizational change management model will lead to moral problems and potentially the failure in our ability as an organization to meet out mission in service delivery.

Recommendations resulting from this research are:

1. The GCFD should adopt a formal process to manage change. The adopted change management model should be used with any significant organizational change effecting the department. Improvement is not a one-time effort. Management is responsible for leading the organization into the practice of continual improvement in quality and productivity. This recommendation will be included in the department goals and objectives for 2007, with a goal of implementation by mid-year. A committee representing all levels of the department should be created to work on the development of the appropriate model.
2. The results of the impact of change department survey issued as part of this ARP should be reviewed with all department personnel during the first training session in January 2007. This survey should be repeated annually in an effort to evaluate our progress in managing change within the department.
3. Enhancement of communications within the department must improve. Exclusionary communication must be kept at a minimum recognizing the harmful effect this type of communication has on personnel. Regularly scheduled department meetings must be held a minimum of two times a year and consider quarterly meetings.
4. A culture of trust and respect must be fostered and enhanced with the goal of improving two-way communication and effectiveness.
5. Training should be provided to all supervisory personnel regarding effective communication and effective change leadership fundamentals. Once a change management model has been developed training should be provided to all personnel on

the chosen model with an emphasis placed on effectively managing and utilizing the model with supervisory personnel.

6. Accountability measures regarding communication should be built into job performance expectations and employee evaluations of all supervisory personnel. Administrative personnel must recognize the importance of improved communication recognizing the additional time needed for supervisory personnel to effectively complete this portion of their job responsibility. Administrative personnel must allow the time necessary for this to occur and monitor the success and/or potential failures of the supervisor or subordinate personnel.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, E. (2004). *Change Without Pain*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Carrizzo, R. & Gerling, K. (2006) *Search for Values*. Retrieved November 1, 2006, from the World Wide Web:
http://firechief.com/management/firefighting_search_values/index.html
- Census 2000. (2006) *Population for the Town of Grand Chute, Wisconsin*. Retrieved October 1, 2006 from the World Wide Web:
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFacts?_event=Search&geo_id=&_geoContext=&_street=&_county=grand+chute&_cityTown=grand+chute&_state=04000US55&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&pctxt=fph&pgsl=010&show_2003_tab=&redirect=Y.
- Coleman, R. (2003). *The Fire Chief's Handbook, Sixth Edition*. Tulsa, Oklahoma: PennWell Corporation.
- Compton, D. (2003). *The Fire Chief's Handbook, Sixth Edition*. Tulsa, Oklahoma: PennWell Corporation.
- Davidson, J. (2002). *The Complete Idiot's Guide To Change Management*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Alpha Books.
- Deming, E. (2000). *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Drucker, P. (1946). *Concept of the Corporation*. Republished 1993, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Edwards, S. (2000). *Fire Service Personnel Management*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

- Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2003). *Executive Fire Officer Program, Operational Policies and Procedures Applied Research Guidelines*. Executive Fire Officer Program Description, I-3.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, United States Fire Administration, National Fire Academy. (2005). *Executive Leadership (EL)*. Student Manual, 5th Edition, 1st Printing - October 2005.
- FireHouse Software©. (2003). *Grand Chute Fire Department Records Management System*. Version 6.1.6 Des Moines, IA: Visionary Systems, LTD.
- Gilley, A. (2005). *The Manager as Change Leader*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Glaser, J. (2006). *The DNA of Leadership*. Avon, Massachusetts: Platinum Press.
- Group I Resources Inc. (2001). *Town of Grand Chute Fire Department Organizational & Facilities Study*. Group I Resources Inc: Lombard, Illinois.
- Kim, W., & Mauborgne, R. (2006). *Tipping Point Leadership*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Publishing, originally published April 2003.
- Kotter, P. (2006). *Leading Change*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Publishing, originally published March-April 1995.
- Lawrence, P., & Dyer, D. (1983). *Renewing American Industry*. New York: Free Press.
- Lowe, E. (2006, April 9). *Chief: Fire Service Needs Overhaul*. Appleton Post Crescent, pp. B1, B3.
- Maslow, A. (2006). *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs*. Retrieved November 1, 2006 from accel-team web site: <http://www.accel-team.com/maslow/.html>
- Scott-Morgan, Hoving, Smit, Van Der Slot. (2001). *The End of Change*. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Strebel, P. (2006). *Why Do Employees Resist Change?* Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Publishing, originally published May-June 1996.
- Town of Grand Chute Fire Department. (2006). *Description of the Grand Chute Fire Department*. Retrieved September 12, 2006 from the World Wide Web:
<http://angelfire.com/wi2/gcfd/>.
- Town of Grand Chute. (2006). *Fire Department Strategic Plan*. Retrieved September 12, 2006 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.grandchute.net/>.
- United States Fire Administration. (2004). Retrieved August 11, 2006 from the United States Fire Administration Web Site: <http://www.usfa.fema.gov>.
- Vitalo, R. (2006) *Kaizen Model*. Retrieved November 1, 2006, from the World Wide Web:
Vital Enterprises web site: http://www.vitalentusa.com/learn/kaizen_1.php.
- Wisconsin Department of Revenue. (2006). *Statement of Equalized Values 2006*. Retrieved October 1, 2006 from the World Wide Web:
<http://www.dor.state.wi.us/equ/2006/strout.pdf>

APPENDIX A

TO: All Department Personnel

FROM: Todd A. Farley, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: Executive Fire Officer Program, Applied Research Paper - Personnel Survey

DATE: October 21, 2006

I am conducting research in regards to evaluating the impact of change within the Grand Chute Fire Department. The following survey and the data collected will be used in an applied research paper I will be submitting as a requirement of the Executive Fire Officer Program, of the National Fire Academy.

Your participation in this project is critical and will greatly assist in the evaluation of the impact of change on the department and department personnel. The purpose of this applied research paper is to "identify the human impact of change within the department and then to identify, recommend, and implement effective change management processes." The specific research questions I am seeking to answer are the following:

1. What are the impacts of change among the personnel of the Grand Chute Fire Department?
2. What, if any are other departments of similar size using to identify the impacts of change among department personnel?
3. What, if any are other departments of similar size using to manage change within their organizations?
4. What are recommended strategies or processes for managing change within a fire department?
5. What change management processes would be most effective to improve the outcome and effectively manage change within the Grand Chute Fire Department?

The survey you are being asked to complete are very important to address questions 1 and 5 of the research. In order to effectively address appropriate change management processes I have to understand if a problem exists and if a problem exists I have to understand what the problem or problems are.

Please take the necessary time to complete the survey. When completing the survey be very open, honest, and sincere in your responses. I am asking for your responses and therefore I am very open to whatever your responses are - meaning; I will not take offense to any of your responses or comments. It is very important to me to find out where problems exist and what we can do to fix the problems.

Please complete the survey by **November 6, 2006** and place in my mailbox located at my office. You may place the completed surveys in the envelope provided if you are concerned about anonymity. Thank you for assisting me with this important research project!

Evaluating Change within the Grand Chute Fire Department - Personnel Survey

On a scale of 1-4, circle the number below that indicates your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the statement below.

Part One Organizational Change	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The department has a good track record of managing change (historical)	1	2	3	4
2. The department has a clear focus and sense of direction for the future.	1	2	3	4
3. Changes are made in a way that is consistent with the department's mission.	1	2	3	4
4. The leadership of the department is knowledgeable/up-to-date about strategic planning.	1	2	3	4
5. Change within the department is carefully considered and well planned.	1	2	3	4
6. The leadership of the department is open to different ideas and opinions.	1	2	3	4
7. Employees are actively involved in planning and implementing change.	1	2	3	4
8. Personnel within the department share information with others.	1	2	3	4
9. The rationale for change is effectively communicated to employees.	1	2	3	4
10. Change at this department is driven by facts and information, rather than speculation or opinion.	1	2	3	4
11. The department rewards innovation and creativity.	1	2	3	4
12. In responding to change, the leadership of the department does a good job of keeping employees motivated.	1	2	3	4
13. Employees receive adequate training to keep up with changes with the department.	1	2	3	4
14. Adequate resources are provided to accommodate new processes or standards.	1	2	3	4
15. The department monitors and evaluates the impact of changes that are made.	1	2	3	4
16. Problems arising from change are systematically identified and resolved.	1	2	3	4
17. Communication with the department keeps employees well informed about what is happening and what to expect.	1	2	3	4
18. The department consistently follows-through with plans and decisions.	1	2	3	4

Part One - Continued Organizational Change	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. This department is perceived as innovative and progressive by other departments/organizations.	1	2	3	4
20. The department celebrates its success in achieving positive change.	1	2	3	4
21. The department supports change, calculated risk-taking with its culture.	1	2	3	4
22. Given the current environment, the pace and scope of the change at this department is appropriate.	1	2	3	4
23. Personnel can handle more change at the current rate at which change is occurring.	1	2	3	4

Part Two Your Personal Relationship to Change	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
24. <u>You</u> perceive the department as innovative and progressive.	1	2	3	4
25. I find the speed at which changes occur within the department are manageable and within my scope.	1	2	3	4
26. I understand the reason for the changes.	1	2	3	4
27. I am overwhelmed by the changes that have occurred in the last two years.	1	2	3	4
28. I feel the direction the department is heading is in the right direction.	1	2	3	4
29. I find it easy to balance the requirements placed upon me by the department.	1	2	3	4
30. I feel I am informed and up-to-date with what is occurring in the department.	1	2	3	4
31. I feel I am included in the change management process of the department.	1	2	3	4
32. I feel communication within the department is adequate and working well.	1	2	3	4

Please provide any additional comments as you deem appropriate (If you need more space please feel free to add comments on the following page, and/or separate page):

Part Three

Please complete the following questions addressing the demographics of the personnel completing the survey. This information is very important. The results from this portion of the survey will be kept confidential, however it is very important in the sense of highlighting the impact of change within the department at the varying levels within the department.

Rank: _____

Full Time: _____

Part Time/POC: _____

Age: _____

Years on the Department: _____

Comments Continued (if needed):_____

[illegible]

APPENDIX B

October 20, 2006

Fire Chief,

I am currently in the fourth and final year of the Executive Fire Officer (EFO) program at the National Fire Academy. This program requires an applied research project at the end of each class designed to address a problem specific to the fire service and potentially within the authors department.

This year's class, Executive Leadership focused on leadership issues within the fire service. The research I am conducting focuses on managing change within a fire department. The purpose of this research project is to identify the human impact of change within the department and then to identify, recommend, and implement effective change management processes.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to address two questions in the applied research I am conducting:

1. What, if any are other department of similar size using to identify the impacts of change among department personnel?
2. What, if any are other departments of similar size using to manage change within their organizations?

I am respectfully requesting that you assist me in the completion of this applied research project by taking a few minutes and answering the questions on the next page. Your input is important and vital to the success of the research project. I have enclosed a self-addressed stamped envelope, or if you find it easier to respond electronically, my email address is todd.farley@grandchutefd.org.

Please return your responses to me prior to November 13, 2006. Thank you for taking the time to assist me in the applied research project. If you would like to see the results of the questionnaire please let me know and I will send them to you once I have completed the applied research paper.

Yours in public service,

Todd A. Farley
Fire Chief

Change Survey

Name of your jurisdiction: _____

Name/rank of the person completing
this questionnaire: _____

Phone number/email: _____

1. Within your department have you identified the impact of change among your personnel?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. If your response was "yes" what do you use to identify the impact of change among your personnel?
3. Do you feel your department is effectively managing change?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
4. If your response was "yes" what does your department use to manage change (formal, process, program, procedure, instrument, etc.)?